

1 The Honorable Robert J. Bryan  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON**

11 STATE OF WASHINGTON, Plaintiff,  
12 v.  
13 THE GEO GROUP, INC.,  
14 Defendant.  
15

16 NO. 3:17-cv-05806-RJB  
17 **GEO GROUP'S MOTION FOR A**  
18 **PROTECTIVE ORDER**  
19 **ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED**

20 **INTRODUCTION**

21 The GEO Group, Inc. (“GEO”) moves this Court, pursuant to the Court’s inherent power to  
22 control discovery under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (“Fed. R. Civ. P.”) 26(c)(1), 26(d)(3),  
23 and Local Rules for United States District Court for the Western District of Washington (“L.C.R.”)  
24 26(c), 26(f), for a protective order to allow the Department of Homeland Security (“DHS”) Bureau  
25 of Immigration and Customs Enforcement (“ICE”) to review documents and identify for GEO any  
26 portions for redaction, in whole or in part, prior to production to Plaintiff the State of Washington  
27 (“the State”).

28 GEO is a private litigant currently trapped between two diametrically opposed duties: (1) its discovery obligations in the above action, and (2) its contractual, statutory, and regulatory

29 STATE OF WASHINGTON V. GEO GROUP  
30 ECF CASE NO. 3:17-cv-05806-RJB  
31 GEO GROUP'S MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE  
32 ORDER

33 NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP  
34 Andrea D’Ambra  
35 1301 Avenue of the Americas  
36 New York, NY 10019  
37 Telephone: (212) 318-3000  
38 andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com

1 obligations to safeguard ICE documents. Discovery of documents prior to ICE review and approval  
 2 exposes GEO to legal liabilities, financial harm, and otherwise compromises privacy rights and the  
 3 safety and security of personnel and detainees at the Northwest Detention Center (“NWDC”). The  
 4 prejudice to both GEO and to the State from delay caused by the federal government’s review must  
 5 be balanced by the Court and may not be unilaterally resolved by GEO on its own.  
 6

7 **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE, FED. R. CIV. P. 26(c) AND L.C.R. 26(c)**

8 In compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) and L.C.R. 26(c), GEO certifies that it has met and  
 9 conferred with the State’s counsel in an effort to resolve the dispute without court action, prior to  
 10 the filing of this motion. Specifically, counsel for GEO and counsel for the State have met and  
 11 conferred telephonically four times – on April 30, May 25, June 12, and June 15, 2018 – regarding  
 12 various discovery issues, including GEO’s obligation to seek DHS/ICE review of certain  
 13 documents prior to production to the State. While reaching agreement on several points, the parties  
 14 have not resolved the issue of ICE review related to the immediate motion. *Declaration of Joan K.*  
*Mell in Support of Defendants’ Motion for a Protective Order* at ¶ 3 (“Mell Decl.”).

15 **FACTS**

16 The State filed its Complaint in Pierce County Superior Court on September 20, 2017. Dkt.  
 17 1. On October 9, 2017, GEO removed to this Court. Dkt. 1, at 1-39. The State alleges two claims  
 18 against GEO: that, by administering the voluntary work program at NWDC pursuant to national  
 19 DHS/ICE standards, it violated Washington’s Minimum Wage Act, Wash. Rev. Code Ann. §  
 20 49.46.005 *et seq.*, and was unjustly enriched. The State served its first set of discovery, including  
 21 requests for production, on January 5, 2018. GEO responded to State’s request for production on  
 22 February 5, 2018. Mell Decl. at ¶ 2, Ex. 1 (GEO’s Responses to the State’s First Requests for  
 23 Production).

24 GEO subsequently engaged in a good faith and rigorous process to interview custodians,  
 25 identify appropriate data sources, collect these documents from electronic, structured data, and hard  
 26

copy sources, process this large set of documents, and cull the data set to prepare the responsive records for production. *Declaration of Andrea L. D'Ambra in Support of Defendants' Motion for a Protective Order* ("D'Ambra Decl.") at ¶ 5. Due to the large volume of documents to be reviewed and processed, GEO informed the State that it would engage in a rolling production of documents. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 6. In tandem with its document review, GEO has met, conferred, and exchanged several drafts of what would become the Stipulated Protective Order that was filed with this Court on June 20, 2018. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 7; Dkt. 62-1.

In a good faith effort to start the flow of documents to the State, GEO expended substantial additional time and effort identifying documents within the responsive universe that could be produced without the Stipulated Protective Order in place and without ICE review and approval. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 8. GEO continues to work in good faith to identify additional documents that can be produced and, to date, GEO has provided the State with two productions without ICE review: (1) on February 2, 2018 with initial disclosures, and (2) on May 31, 2018 as part of its first production. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 9. These productions are substantial – totaling 504 documents with 15,115 pages. *Id.* Should the Stipulated Protective Order be entered by the Court, GEO anticipates that it will produce additional documents responsive to State's first set of discovery requests, as well as to the second set of requests that it recently served on June 12, 2018.

As part of its obligations as a contracting entity with the Department of Homeland Security, GEO has certain statutory, regulatory, and contractual obligations to restrict the dissemination of certain categories of information and must get express clearance from ICE before disclosing documents related to the detainees in GEO's custody and the procedures around that detention. Mell Decl. at ¶ 3-4, 6. *See, e.g.*, 8 C.F.R. § 236.6 ("No person, including . . . any privately operated detention facility, that houses, maintains, provides services to, or otherwise holds any detainee . . . shall disclose or otherwise permit to be made public the name of, or other information relating to, such detainee."). Thus, within its review of documents for the above captioned case, GEO

1 identified responsive documents for which it is obligated to obtain DHS/ICE review and approval  
 2 before producing to the State. From the very first meet and confer with the State, GEO made it  
 3 absolutely clear that GEO had this obligation and that it could not control how long it would take  
 4 for ICE to complete its review. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 3; Mell Decl. at ¶ 3. However, only after  
 5 GEO's attorneys analyzed the universe of responsive documents was GEO able to know the full  
 6 extent of documents requiring DHS/ICE review. *Id.* These documents include, but are not limited  
 7 to, modifications of GEO's contract with ICE concerning the NWDC, communications with ICE,  
 8 records concerning ICE inspections and audits of the NWDC, commissary reports, documents  
 9 containing information regarding detainee identification and immigration status, and other  
 10 documents that GEO believes to contain sensitive information protected under the GEO-ICE  
 11 contract and the corresponding rules, regulations, and statutes. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 13.

12 Over the past weeks, GEO has worked diligently to secure ICE's review of the documents.  
 13 GEO's counsel has negotiated with Assistant United States Attorney Kristin Johnson, who will  
 14 coordinate DHS/ICE's review of the documents. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 12. On June 12, 2018, Anne  
 15 Rose, Associate Legal Advisor from the Office of Principal Legal Advisor, indicated that DHS/ICE  
 16 will only respond to discovery requests – including subpoenas for deposition testimony and  
 17 requests to review documents – that explicitly comply with DHS' *Touhy* regulations. Mell Decl.  
 18 at ¶ 5. Ms. Rose has since informed GEO that it "has limited resources to be able to process large  
 19 amounts of records" and has yet to provide GEO with a timeframe for its review. *Id.* GEO has  
 20 informed Ms. Rose and Ms. Johnson that it believes a speedy review is required so that it can  
 21 produce these documents as quickly as possible in this litigation. *Id.* As of yet, ICE has not  
 22 authorized GEO to release documents requested in discovery from GEO in this litigation without  
 23 ICE first reviewing the documents for redaction and/or withholding prior to GEO producing the  
 24 records to Washington State. *Id.* at ¶ 6.

## **STATEMENT OF ISSUES**

Whether this Court should enter a protective order allowing for production of documents pending ICE review and permitting GEO to redact or withhold information ICE determines may not be disclosed?

## LEGAL AUTHORITY

This Court may, for good cause, issue a protective order to “protect a party or person from annoyance, embarrassment, oppression, or undue burden or expense, including . . . specifying terms . . . for the disclosure or discovery.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c)(1)(B). Trial courts are given broad discretion in determining when a protective order is appropriate. *See Trade Assocs. Inc. v. Fusion Techs. Inc.*, No. 09-5804RJB, 2010 WL 11530556, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Sept. 29, 2010) (Bryan, D.J.) (citing *Phillips ex rel. Estates of Byrd v. General Motors Corp.*, 307 F.3d 1206, 1210 (9th Cir. 2002)). If a court finds particularized harm will result from disclosure of information to the public, then it balances the public and private interests to decide whether a protective order is necessary. *See Solis v. Washington, Dep’t of Corr.*, No. 08-5362RJB, 2009 WL 10676491, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Oct. 15, 2009) (Bryan, D.J.) (citing *Rivera v. NIBCO, Inc.*, 364 F.3d 1057, 1063 (9th Cir. 2004)). GEO has no authority to disclose DHS/ICE documents absent DHS/ICE review and approval without violating the law. GEO acknowledges that the delay in production of documents pending ICE review prejudices both parties, but has offered on several occasions to agree to an extension of the scheduling order in order to eliminate any prejudice caused by this delay. As such, the Court should permit DHS/ICE to review and authorize the disclosure of information, and GEO should not be compelled to disclose information that is subject to DHS/ICE’s requirements prior to approval by DHS/ICE.

**I. Production of DHS/ICE Documents Without Prior DHS/ICE Approval Will Result in Particularized Harm to GEO and Non-Parties**

Compelling production of documents that must be reviewed by DHS/ICE would harm a number of interests – both those of GEO and non-parties. Rather than merely relying on “broad allegations of harm” that this Court has found unpersuasive in the past, *see Radiator Exp.*

*Warehouse, Inc. v. Performance Radiator Pac. LLC*, No. 09-5691RJB, 2010 WL 3222516, at \*1 (W.D. Wash. Aug. 13, 2010) (Bryan, D.J.) (denying motion for protective order based only on “broad allegation of harm”), GEO instead provides specific examples below with articulated reasoning in order to show good cause.

## A. Potential Criminal Sanctions, Breach of Contract, and Financial Harm to GEO

First and foremost, prematurely producing to the State documents slated for DHS/ICE review would force GEO to violate federal law stating that documents with detainee information are DHS/ICE property and that ICE must determine the extent to which such records may be disclosed. As a preliminary matter, GEO does not own or control records related to detainees – DHS/ICE does. That control is clearly articulated both in DHS/ICE regulations and GEO’s most recent contract with ICE to operate the NWDC (“GEO-ICE Contract”). *See, e.g.*, 8 C.F.R. § 236.6; GEO-ICE Contract, Dkt. 19 at 49 (stating that GEO “shall be responsible for detainee record keeping services and personal property” and “create and update detainee records” but that “[a]ll records will remain the property of the U.S. Government.”) and 125 (“[t]he Government may review 100% of the documents . . . at any point during the period of performance”).

As a government contractor operating at the direction of DHS/ICE, GEO faces several unique discovery-related restrictions. DHS/ICE, like many other federal agencies, has adopted *Touhy*<sup>1</sup> regulations, that severely limit how DHS employees, including contractors, may respond to discovery requests such as in the above action. *See* 6 C.F.R. § 5.41 (defining DHS employees to include contractors “subject to the supervision, jurisdiction, or control of the Secretary of Homeland Security”). Pursuant to *Touhy*, GEO is not allowed to “produce any document or any material acquired as part of the performance of that employee’s duties or by virtue of that employee’s official status, unless authorized to do so by the Office of the General Counsel . . . .” *See* 6 C.F.R. § 5.44(b). Federal law also explicitly prohibits GEO, acting on its own volition, from

<sup>1</sup> *United States ex rel. Touhy v. Ragen*, 340 U.S. 462, 467-70 (1951).

1 disclosing detainee information. *See* 8 C.F.R. § 236.6 (“No person, including . . . any privately  
 2 operated detention facility, that houses, maintains, provides services to, or otherwise holds any  
 3 detainee . . . shall disclose or otherwise permit to be made public the name of, or other information  
 4 relating to, such detainee.”).

5 Instead, GEO must submit the documents for DHS/ICE review, which is memorialized both  
 6 in DHS/ICE guidance and the terms of the GEO-ICE Contract. For example, DHS Management  
 7 Directive 11042.1, which regards “identification and safeguarding of sensitive but unclassified  
 8 information” and is applicable to government contractors like GEO, broadly defines documents  
 9 “For Official Use Only” (“FOUO”) as those for which “unauthorized disclosure of which could  
 10 adversely impact a person’s privacy or welfare, the conduct of Federal programs, or other programs  
 11 or operations essential to the national interest.” Mell Decl. at ¶ 4, Ex. 2 (DHS Management  
 12 Directive 11042.1). Pursuant to the directive, the party seeking FOUO information must write a  
 13 request and the “DHS program office shall then determine if it is appropriate to release the  
 14 information.” *Id.* Likewise, the GEO-ICE Contract obligates GEO to “cooperate with Government  
 15 legal staff and/or the USAO regarding any requests pertaining to federal or Contractor litigation.”  
 16 GEO-ICE Contract, Dkt. 19, at 57. As a result, GEO must cooperate with DHS/ICE to ensure that  
 17 “no public disclosures regarding this contract [are] made by the Contractor (or any subcontractors)  
 18 without review and approval of such disclosure.” *Id.* at 85.

19 GEO cannot waive DHS/ICE’s statutory or contractual rights to review and redact  
 20 documents under DHS/ICE’s control. Indeed “[c]ourts, in construing regulations which control the  
 21 release of official information, have held that such information should not be compelled to be  
 22 produced in violation of these regulations.” *Am. Sav. Bank v. Painewebber Inc.*, 210 F.R.D. 721,  
 23 722 (D. Haw. 2001) (denying in part parties’ motions to compel Office of Thrift Supervision  
 24 information from each other and ordering the parties to “request[] permission from OTS to use  
 25 unpublished OTS information in the litigation.”); *see also In re Countrywide Fin. Corp. Sec. Litig.*,

No. 07-CV-5295-MRP MANX, 2009 WL 5125089, at \*2 (C.D. Cal. Dec. 28, 2009) (“If the [Federal Reserve Board] and [Office of the Comptroller of the Currency] do not authorize disclosure of the information . . . then the parties can seek the appropriate relief from this Court regarding document production.”). Furthermore, ICE has represented that it is required to review these documents and redact certain confidential information if necessary. Mell Decl. at ¶ 5. ICE further represented that this remains the case even if there is a protective order in place in a litigation. *Id.* GEO is under these circumstances caught between the proverbial rock and a hard spot. Whether ICE chooses to intervene to address its concerns is not yet known.

Violation of these obligations can result in sanctions, including criminal penalties. *See, e.g.*, 18 U.S.C.A. § 2071(a) (“Whoever willfully and unlawfully . . . removes . . . any record . . . filed or deposited with any clerk or officer of any court of the United States, or in any public office, or with any judicial or public officer of the United States, shall be fined under this title or imprisoned not more than three years, or both.”). These penalties are neither speculative nor newly raised in this motion, but rather were specifically contemplated by the parties and addressed in the GEO-ICE Contract executed in 2015. *See* GEO-ICE Contract, Dkt. 19, at 50 (“Criminal penalties for . . . improperly handling or releasing federal records are addressed in Chapters 37 and 101 of Title 18, United States Code.”). In addition, the GEO-ICE contract and supporting documentation requires DHS/ICE’s review and approval. *See* GEO-ICE Contract, Dkt. 19, at 85; Mell Decl., at ¶ 4. The GEO-ICE contract also requires GEO to adhere to DHS Non-Disclosure Agreement Requirements. *Id.* at 44. To ensure compliance with its non-disclosure obligations, GEO requires NWDC employees sign non-disclosure agreements making them aware of these obligations. Finally, disclosures contrary to law could raise the risk of legal action against GEO by detainees or contract termination with long-term blacklisting under federal laws that preclude contracting with entities that violate federal laws.

## B. Security and Safety Concerns for Non-Parties

2 Not only will GEO suffer if DHS/ICE is not given the opportunity to review the applicable  
3 documents and approve their production, but non-party security and safety interests will also be  
4 jeopardized. Courts in the Ninth Circuit have recognized that “prison litigation poses unique risks  
5 for both the inmates and the prison, justifying limitations on the disclosure of such information.”  
6 *Castillon v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*, No. 1:12-CV-00559-EJL, 2013 WL 4039478, at \*3 (D. Idaho Aug.  
7 6, 2013) (granting motion limiting disclosure of security-related information from privately  
8 operated state prison to plaintiff’s counsel); *see also Solis*, 2009 WL 10676491, at \*1 (entering  
9 protective order covering confidential information related to correctional officials). GEO similarly  
10 has an enforceable state law order restricting the public’s access to Northwest Detention Center  
11 records for safety and security reasons. Mell Decl. at ¶ 4, Ex. 3 (Pierce County Order Enjoining  
12 Disclosure of Records). Regardless of whether the facility in question is a privately operated prison  
13 or detention center, the consequences of disclosing information that ICE has not authorized for  
14 disclosure triggers irreparable harm. *See, e.g., Castillon*, 2013 WL 4039478, at \*2 (“any  
15 information disclosed to Plaintiffs could end up in the hands of other inmates, and that information  
16 could easily be passed to individuals outside of prison who would be able to threaten, injure, or kill  
17 correctional employees or their families.”). Indeed, once in the hands of an opposing party—  
18 ***particularly one like the State, which has public disclosure requirements***—the risk of disclosure  
19 to parties other than those contemplated in the Stipulated Protective Order is significant. *See Wash.*  
20 *Rev. Code Ann. § 42.56, et seq.*

21 Neither the State – represented in this action by the Attorney General of Washington – nor  
22 GEO – a private contractor – has the requisite knowledge or training to evaluate and pass judgment  
23 on what documents pose security or safety risks or otherwise implicate DHS/ICE regulations.  
24 Should ICE withhold a document in whole or in part, this Court may assess whether ICE has proper  
25 grounds for withholding these documents. *See Aguilar v. Immigration & Customs Enf't Div. of the*  
26 *U.S. Dep't of Homeland Sec.*, 259 F.R.D. 51, 56 (S.D.N.Y. 2009) (assessing DHS's reliance on the

1 law enforcement privilege and denying Plaintiff's motion to compel in part after balancing "the  
 2 alleged need for the information against the public's interest in disclosure or nondisclosure.").  
 3 DHS/ICE is best positioned to effectuate the federal immigration laws it is tasked with  
 4 implementing and enforcing, which would include identifying information deemed protected under  
 5 existing laws due to the privacy, safety, and security concerns. *Kaye v. U.S. Dep't of Homeland*  
 6 *Sec.*, No. 16-CV-9384 (VEC), 2018 WL 456303, at \*2 (S.D.N.Y. Jan. 17, 2018) ("[T]he Court  
 7 defers to the agency's assessment of the risk" and finds DHS "properly withheld" a witness  
 8 statement from a FOIA request). As such, the harm suffered by non-parties as a result of producing  
 9 the documents at issue will be significantly mitigated if DHS/ICE reviews and, if necessary,  
 10 arranges for redaction of certain content. *See Bryant v. Romero*, No. 112CV02074DADGSAPC,  
 11 2017 WL 495634, at \*5 (E.D. Cal. Feb. 6, 2017) (granting protective order allowing non-party  
 12 California Department of Corrections to review and redact confidential information prior to  
 13 production based on safety, security, and privacy concerns embodied in state law).

14 Adhering to DHS/ICE's legally required procedures, which in this case requires routing  
 15 discovery through DHS/ICE as a non-party, may slow the pace of discovery. But this is a necessary  
 16 facet of how the State has structured this lawsuit and this Court's denial of GEO's request that ICE  
 17 be added as a party. *See* Dkt. 58 at 12. The State made the decision to sue GEO alone, without  
 18 joining the government in this suit and the Court did not require that the relevant federal agency be  
 19 added to this case. *Id.*

## 20 **II. Private Interests Greatly Outweigh the Public's Interest in Immediate Disclosure**

21 As reflected above, GEO has a substantial interest in obtaining a protective order for  
 22 documents required to be reviewed DHS/ICE. That interest is straightforward and without  
 23 controversy: GEO wishes to comply with both its statutory and contractual obligations without  
 24 risking criminal or economic penalties. In seeking this protective order GEO also advances the  
 25 interests of three other entities: (1) DHS/ICE, which is charged with enforcing the law to maintain

1 safe and secure detention facilities; (2) DHS/ICE staff and GEO personnel, whose safety and  
 2 privacy is assured, in part, by keeping sensitive information related to the operations of the NWDC  
 3 as well as their own identities private; and (3) the detainees formerly or currently resident at the  
 4 NWDC, whose identity, immigration status, etc. are memorialized in DHS/ICE documents that  
 5 GEO possesses, but ultimately does not control.

6 Non-party interests outweigh the parties' interests in prosecuting and defending this case.  
 7 Both parties have acknowledged the discovery challenges at issue during the series of meet-and-  
 8 confer conversations. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 2; Mell Decl. at ¶ 3. However, the State insists that the  
 9 State may receive the discovery without ICE review subject to the Stipulated Protective Order  
 10 without implicating the above referenced restrictions on GEO disclosure of ICE records. GEO  
 11 disagrees that a protective order allows GEO to treat a disclosure of records to ICE as a non-  
 12 disclosure. GEO also questions the Attorney General's authority to restrict disclosure of records  
 13 not expressly exempt from public disclosure under Washington's Public Records Act. *See, e.g.*,  
 14 Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 42.56.080(2) ("agencies shall, upon request for identifiable public records,  
 15 make them promptly available to any person . . ."). GEO has no ability on its own to resolve its  
 16 competing duties even though continuing delay prejudices GEO in preparing its defenses just like  
 17 unlimited delay prejudices the State preparing its case. GEO has indicated it would be willing to  
 18 agree to any additional extension to the case schedule required to ensure the State is not prejudiced  
 19 by the delay caused by ICE's review. D'Ambra Decl. at ¶ 4. GEO anticipates that the State will  
 20 instead move individually for an adjustment to the case schedule.

21 **III. This Court Should Grant GEO a Brief Reprieve from the Production of Specific  
 22 Documents Pending DHS/ICE Review**

23 Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) confers upon this Court broad discretion not only to decide when a  
 24 protective order is appropriate, but also "*to what degree of protection is required.*" *See, e.g.*, *Seattle*  
*25 Times Co. v. Rhinehart*, 467 U.S. 20, 36, 104 S.Ct. 2199, 81 L.Ed.2d 17 (1984) (emphasis added).  
 26 GEO seeks a limited protective order to allow for necessary procedural steps to occur that involve

1 DHS/ICE, a non-party over which GEO has no control. GEO does not by way of this motion seek  
2 to limit the scope of discovery or otherwise preclude the disclosure of responsive records. Instead,  
3 GEO's proposed protective order would merely allow for ICE review prior to disclosure of ICE  
4 records to the State.

5 **CONCLUSION**

6 For the above reasons, GEO should be granted a protective order.

27 STATE OF WASHINGTON v. GEO GROUP  
28 ECF CASE NO. 3:17-CV-05806-RJB  
GEO GROUP'S MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE  
ORDER

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP  
Andrea D'Ambra  
1301 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 318-3000  
andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com

1 Dated: June 21, 2018

**NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP**

2  
3 */s/ Andrea D'Amra* \_\_\_\_\_

4 Andrea D'Amra  
5 1301 Avenue of the Americas  
6 New York, NY 10019  
7 Telephone: (212) 318-3000  
8 Facsimile: (212) 318-3400  
9 andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com

10  
11 **NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP**

12 Charles A. Deacon  
13 300 Convent St.  
14 San Antonio, Texas 78205  
15 Telephone: (210) 270-7133  
16 Facsimile: (210) 270-7205  
17 charlie.deacon@nortonrosefulbright.com

18  
19 **NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP**

20 Mark Emery  
21 799 9th Street NW, Suite 1000  
22 Washington, DC 20001-4501  
23 Telephone: (202) 662-0210  
24 Facsimile: (202) 662-4643  
25 mark.emery@nortonrosefulbright.com

26  
27 **III BRANCHES LAW PLLC**

28 Joan K. Mell, WSBA #21319  
1019 Regents Blvd. Ste. 204  
Fircrest, WA 98466  
253-566-2510 (P)  
281-664-4643 (F)  
joan@3brancheslaw.com

29  
30 **ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT**  
31 **THE GEO GROUP, INC.**

32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 STATE OF WASHINGTON v. GEO GROUP  
39 EOF CASE NO. 3:17-CV-05806-RJB  
40 DEFENDANT THE GEO GROUP, INC.'S MOTION  
41 FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
5510  
5511  
5512  
5513  
5514  
5515  
5516  
5517  
5518  
5519  
5520  
5521  
5522  
5523  
5524  
5525  
5526  
5527  
5528  
5529  
55210  
55211  
55212  
55213  
55214  
55215  
55216  
55217  
55218  
55219  
55220  
55221  
55222  
55223  
55224  
55225  
55226  
55227  
55228  
55229  
55230  
55231  
55232  
55233  
55234  
55235  
55236  
55237  
55238  
55239  
55240  
55241  
55242  
55243  
55244  
55245  
55246  
55247  
55248  
55249  
55250  
55251  
55252  
55253  
55254  
55255  
55256  
55257  
55258  
55259  
55260  
55261  
55262  
55263  
55264  
55265  
55266  
55267  
55268  
55269  
55270  
55271  
55272  
55273  
55274  
55275  
55276  
55277  
55278  
55279  
55280  
55281  
55282  
55283  
55284  
55285  
55286  
55287  
55288  
55289  
55290  
55291  
55292  
55293  
55294  
55295  
55296  
55297  
55298  
55299  
552100  
552101  
552102  
552103  
552104  
552105  
552106  
552107  
552108  
552109  
552110  
552111  
552112  
552113  
552114  
552115  
552116  
552117  
552118  
552119  
552120  
552121  
552122  
552123  
552124  
552125  
552126  
552127  
552128  
552129  
552130  
552131  
552132  
552133  
552134  
552135  
552136  
552137  
552138  
552139  
552140  
552141  
552142  
552143  
552144  
552145  
552146  
552147  
552148  
552149  
552150  
552151  
552152  
552153  
552154  
552155  
552156  
552157  
552158  
552159  
552160  
552161  
552162  
552163  
552164  
552165  
552166  
552167  
552168  
552169  
552170  
552171  
552172  
552173  
552174  
552175  
552176  
552177  
552178  
552179  
552180  
552181  
552182  
552183  
552184  
552185  
552186  
552187  
552188  
552189  
552190  
552191  
552192  
552193  
552194  
552195  
552196  
552197  
552198  
552199  
552200  
552201  
552202  
552203  
552204  
552205  
552206  
552207  
552208  
552209  
552210  
552211  
552212  
552213  
552214  
552215  
552216  
552217  
552218  
552219  
552220  
552221  
552222  
552223  
552224  
552225  
552226  
552227  
552228  
552229  
552230  
552231  
552232  
552233  
552234  
552235  
552236  
552237  
552238  
552239  
552240  
552241  
552242  
552243  
552244  
552245  
552246  
552247  
552248  
552249  
552250  
552251  
552252  
552253  
552254  
552255  
552256  
552257  
552258  
552259  
552260  
552261  
552262  
552263  
552264  
552265  
552266  
552267  
552268  
552269  
552270  
552271  
552272  
552273  
552274  
552275  
552276  
552277  
552278  
552279  
552280  
552281  
552282  
552283  
552284  
552285  
552286  
552287  
552288  
552289  
552290  
552291  
552292  
552293  
552294  
552295  
552296  
552297  
552298  
552299  
5522100  
5522101  
5522102  
5522103  
5522104  
5522105  
5522106  
5522107  
5522108  
5522109  
5522110  
5522111  
5522112  
5522113  
5522114  
5522115  
5522116  
5522117  
5522118  
5522119  
5522120  
5522121  
5522122  
5522123  
5522124  
5522125  
5522126  
5522127  
5522128  
5522129  
5522130  
5522131  
5522132  
5522133  
5522134  
5522135  
5522136  
5522137  
5522138  
5522139  
5522140  
5522141  
5522142  
5522143  
5522144  
5522145  
5522146  
5522147  
5522148  
5522149  
5522150  
5522151  
5522152  
5522153  
5522154  
5522155  
5522156  
5522157  
5522158  
5522159  
5522160  
5522161  
5522162  
5522163  
5522164  
5522165  
5522166  
5522167  
5522168  
5522169  
5522170  
5522171  
5522172  
5522173  
5522174  
5522175  
5522176  
5522177  
5522178  
5522179  
5522180  
5522181  
5522182  
5522183  
5522184  
5522185  
5522186  
5522187  
5522188  
5522189  
5522190  
5522191  
5522192  
5522193  
5522194  
5522195  
5522196  
5522197  
5522198  
5522199  
5522200  
5522201  
5522202  
5522203  
5522204  
5522205  
5522206  
5522207  
5522208  
5522209  
5522210  
5522211  
5522212  
5522213  
5522214  
5522215  
5522216  
5522217  
5522218  
5522219  
5522220  
5522221  
5522222  
5522223  
5522224  
5522225  
5522226  
5522227  
5522228  
5522229  
55222210  
55222211  
55222212  
55222213  
55222214  
55222215  
55222216  
55222217  
55222218  
55222219  
55222220  
55222221  
55222222  
55222223  
55222224  
55222225  
55222226  
55222227  
55222228  
55222229  
55222230  
55222231  
55222232  
55222233  
55222234  
55222235  
55222236  
55222237  
55222238  
55222239  
55222240  
55222241  
55222242  
55222243  
55222244  
55222245  
55222246  
55222247  
55222248  
55222249  
55222250  
55222251  
55222252  
55222253  
55222254  
55222255  
55222256  
55222257  
55222258  
55222259  
55222260  
55222261  
55222262  
55222263  
55222264  
55222265  
55222266  
55222267  
55222268  
55222269  
55222270  
55222271  
55222272  
55222273  
55222274  
55222275  
55222276  
55222277  
55222278  
55222279  
55222280  
55222281  
55222282  
55222283  
55222284  
55222285  
55222286  
55222287  
55222288  
55222289  
55222290  
55222291  
55222292  
55222293  
55222294  
55222295  
55222296  
55222297  
55222298  
55222299  
552222100  
552222101  
552222102  
552222103  
552222104  
552222105  
552222106  
552222107  
552222108  
552222109  
552222110  
552222111  
552222112  
552222113  
552222114  
552222115  
552222116  
552222117  
552222118  
552222119  
552222120  
552222121  
552222122  
552222123  
552222124  
552222125  
552222126  
552222127  
552222128  
552222129  
552222130  
552222131  
552222132  
552222133  
552222134  
552222135  
552222136  
552222137  
552222138  
552222139  
552222140  
552222141  
552222142  
552222143  
552222144  
552222145  
552222146  
552222147  
552222148  
552222149  
552222150  
552222151  
552222152  
552222153  
552222154  
552222155  
552222156  
552222157  
552222158  
552222159  
552222160  
552222161  
552222162  
552222163  
552222164  
552222165  
552222166  
552222167  
552222168  
552222169  
552222170  
552222171  
552222172  
552222173  
552222174  
552222175  
552222176  
552222177  
552222178  
552222179  
552222180  
552222181  
552222182  
552222183  
552222184  
552222185  
552222186  
552222187  
552222188  
552222189  
552222190  
552222191  
552222192  
552222193  
552222194  
552222195  
552222196  
552222197  
552222198  
552222199  
552222200  
552222201  
552222202  
552222203  
552222204  
552222205  
552222206  
552222207  
552222208  
552222209  
552222210  
552222211  
552222212  
552222213  
552222214  
552222215  
552222216  
552222217  
552222218  
552222219  
552222220  
552222221  
552222222  
552222223  
552222224  
552222225  
552222226  
552222227  
552222228  
552222229  
552222230  
552222231  
552222232  
552222233  
552222234  
552222235  
552222236  
552222237  
552222238  
552222239  
552222240  
552222241  
552222242  
552222243  
552222244  
552222245  
552222246  
552222247  
552222248  
552222249  
552222250  
552222251  
552222252  
552222253  
552222254  
552222255  
552222256  
552222257  
552222258  
552222259  
552222260  
552222261  
552222262  
552222263  
552222264  
552222265  
552222266  
552222267  
552222268  
552222269  
552222270  
552222271  
552222272  
552222273  
552222274  
552222275  
552222276  
552222277  
552222278  
552222279  
552222280  
552222281  
552222282  
552222283  
552222284  
552222285  
552222286  
552222287  
552222288  
552222289  
552222290  
552222291  
552222292  
552222293  
552222294  
552222295  
552222296  
552222297  
552222298  
552222299  
5522222100  
5522222101  
5522222102  
5522222103  
5522222104  
5522222105  
5522222106  
5522222107  
5522222108  
5522222109  
5522222110  
5522222111  
5522222112  
5522222113  
5522222114  
5522222115  
5522222116  
5522222117  
5522222118  
5522222119  
5522222120  
5522222121  
5522222122  
5522222123  
5522222124  
5522222125  
5522222126  
5522222127  
5522222128  
5522222129  
5522222130  
5522222131  
5522222132  
5522222133  
5522222134  
5522222135  
5522222136  
5522222137  
5522222138  
5522222139  
5522222140  
5522222141  
5522222142  
5522222143  
5522222144  
5522222145  
5522222146  
5522222147  
5522222148  
5522222149  
5522222150  
5522222151  
5522222152  
5522222153  
5522222154  
5522222155  
5522222156  
5522222157  
5522222158  
5522222159  
5522222160  
5522222161  
5522222162  
5522222163  
5522222164  
5522222165  
5522222166  
5522222167  
5522222168  
5522222169  
5522222170  
5522222171  
5522222172  
5522222173  
5522222174  
5522222175  
5522222176  
5522222177  
5522222178  
5522222179  
5522222180  
5522222181  
5522222182  
5522222183  
5522222184  
5522222185  
5522222186  
5522222187  
5522222188  
5522222189  
5522222190  
5522222191  
5522222192  
5522222193<br

## **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I, Susana Medeiros, hereby certify as follows:

I am over the age of 18, a resident of New York County, and not a party to the above action. On June 21, 2018, I electronically served the above Motion for a Protective Order via Email to the following:

Office of the Attorney General  
La Rond Baker, WSBA No. 43610  
Marsha Chien, WSBA No. 47020  
800 Fifth Avenue, Suite 2000  
Seattle, WA 98104  
LaRondB@atg.wa.gov  
MarshaC@atg.wa.gov

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP  
Charles A. Deacon (Pro Hac Vice)  
300 Convent St.  
San Antonio, TX 78205  
(210)-270-7133  
[charlie.deacon@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:charlie.deacon@nortonrosefulbright.com)

Norton Rose Fulbright US LLP  
Mark Emery (Pro Hac Vice)  
799 9th St. NW, Suite 1000  
Washington, DC 20001-4501  
(202)-662-0210  
[mark.emery@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:mark.emery@nortonrosefulbright.com)

III Branches Law, PLLC  
Joan K. Mell, WSBA #21319  
1019 Regents Blvd. Ste. 204  
Fircrest, WA 98466  
253-566-2510 (P)  
281-664-4643 (F)  
[joan@3brancheslaw.com](mailto:joan@3brancheslaw.com)

STATE OF WASHINGTON v. GEO GROUP  
EOF CASE NO. 3:17-CV-05806-RJB  
DEFENDANT THE GEO GROUP, INC.'S MOTION  
FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP  
Andrea D’Ambra  
1301 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 318-3000  
[andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com](mailto:andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com)

1 I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Washington that the above  
2 information is true and correct.  
3

4 DATED this 21<sup>st</sup> day of June, 2018 at New York, New York.  
5  
6   
7 Susana Medeiros  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

STATE OF WASHINGTON v. GEO GROUP  
ECF CASE NO. 3:17-CV-05806-RJB  
GEO GROUP'S MOTION FOR A PROTECTIVE  
ORDER

NORTON ROSE FULBRIGHT US LLP  
Andrea D'Ambra  
1301 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10019  
Telephone: (212) 318-3000  
andrea.dambra@nortonrosefulbright.com